

US Supreme Court Research

Will the Supreme Court Affirm or Reverse the decision of the lower court? Can we build a statistical model to predict this behavior

Ryan Levy (fpp5kw)

2024-11-19

```
library(tidyr)
library(dplyr)

##
## Attaching package: 'dplyr'

## The following objects are masked from 'package:stats':
##
##   filter, lag

## The following objects are masked from 'package:base':
##
##   intersect, setdiff, setequal, union

library(knitr)
knit_print.data.frame <- function(x, ...) {
  kable(head(x, n = 6), ...) # Automatically format head() output
}
```

Introduction

The majority of the cases the United States Supreme Court hears are appeals from lower courts. The interest of this project is to build a prediction model to classify for a given case, will the court affirm or deny the lower courts decision.

Data

The data is collected from The Supreme Court Database, created by Harold J. Spaeth funded by the National Science Foundation classifying every single vote by a Supreme Court justice in all argued cases from 1946 to 2022.

Case Centered Data

Case centered data provides case level information, each row corresponds to a dispute, no justice specific information.

Organized by Citation

One row for each dispute. Consolidated cases with multiple dockets or issues are included once.

Organized by Docket

Each case may have multiple dockets within it. This databases includes one row for each docket.

Organized by Issue/Legal Provision

Each docket may include multiple issues/legal provisions. This database includes a row for each issue/legal provision for each docket.

Justice Centered Data

Justice centered data includes a set of justice votes for each dispute.

Organized by Citation

One set of justice votes for each dispute. Consolidated cases with multiple dockets or issues are included once.

Organized by Docket

Each case may have multiple dockets within it. This databases includes one set of justice votes for each docket.

Organized by Issue/Legal Provision

Each docket may include multiple issues/legal provisions. This database includes one set of justice votes for each issue/legal provision for each docket.

Exploratory Data Analysis: Case Centered Data

Loading Data

```
case_circuit <- read.csv('https://raw.githubusercontent.com/rlevy820/scotus-research/refs/heads/main/data/case_circuit.csv')
case_docket <- read.csv('https://raw.githubusercontent.com/rlevy820/scotus-research/refs/heads/main/data/case_docket.csv')
case_legal <- read.csv('https://raw.githubusercontent.com/rlevy820/scotus-research/refs/heads/main/data/case_legal.csv')

justice_circuit <- read.csv('~/.Desktop/Personal/Research/SCOTUS Research/Data/SCDB_2024_01_justiceCentered.csv')
justice_docket <- read.csv('~/.Desktop/Personal/Research/SCOTUS Research/Data/SCDB_2024_01_justiceCentered.csv')
justice_legal <- read.csv('~/.Desktop/Personal/Research/SCOTUS Research/Data/SCDB_2024_01_justiceCentered.csv')
```

Comparing Databases: Case Centered Data

```
# Are there any columns in one table that is not in another
cols <- list(case_circuit = colnames(case_circuit), case_docket = colnames(case_docket), case_legal = colnames(case_legal))

if (all(sapply(cols, function(x) identical(x, cols[[1]])))) {
  print("All column names are the same.")
} else {
  print("Columns differ between tables.")
}
```

```
## [1] "All column names are the same."
```

```
# are there any tables that contain all the rows of the other tables

# Find differing rows between tables
diff_circuit_docket <- anti_join(case_circuit, case_docket, by = colnames(case_circuit))
diff_circuit_legal <- anti_join(case_circuit, case_legal, by = colnames(case_circuit))
diff_docket_legal <- anti_join(case_docket, case_legal, by = colnames(case_docket))

# Combine results into a list
differing_rows <- list(
  circuit_not_in_docket = diff_circuit_docket,
  circuit_not_in_legal = diff_circuit_legal,
  docket_not_in_legal = diff_docket_legal
)

# Print summary
lapply(differing_rows, nrow)
```

```
## $circuit_not_in_docket
## [1] 0
##
## $circuit_not_in_legal
## [1] 0
##
## $docket_not_in_legal
## [1] 0
```

The results above show that all rows in `case_circuit` are in `case_legal` and all rows in `case_docket` are in `case_legal`. We can proceed by using only `case_legal` for EDA as it is the superset of the case centered data.

Comparing Databases: Justice Centered Data

```
# Are there any columns in one table that is not in another
cols <- list(justice_circuit = colnames(justice_circuit), justice_docket = colnames(justice_docket), justice_legal = colnames(justice_legal))

if (all(sapply(cols, function(x) identical(x, cols[[1]])))) {
  print("All column names are the same.")
}
```

```

} else {
  print("Columns differ between tables.")
}

```

```
## [1] "All column names are the same."
```

```
# are there any tables that contain all the rows of the other tables
```

```
# Find differing rows between tables
```

```

diff_circuit_docket_j <- anti_join(justice_circuit, justice_docket, by = colnames(justice_circuit))
diff_circuit_legal_j <- anti_join(justice_circuit, justice_legal, by = colnames(justice_circuit))
diff_docket_legal_j <- anti_join(justice_docket, justice_legal, by = colnames(justice_docket))

```

```
# Combine results into a list
```

```

differing_rows_j <- list(
  circuit_not_in_docket_j = diff_circuit_docket_j,
  circuit_not_in_legal_j = diff_circuit_legal_j,
  docket_not_in_legal_j = diff_docket_legal_j
)

```

```
# Print summary
```

```
lapply(differing_rows_j, nrow)
```

```
## $circuit_not_in_docket_j
```

```
## [1] 0
```

```
##
```

```
## $circuit_not_in_legal_j
```

```
## [1] 0
```

```
##
```

```
## $docket_not_in_legal_j
```

```
## [1] 0
```

The results above show that all rows in `justice_circuit` are in `justice_legal` and all rows in `justice_docket` are in `justice_legal`. We can proceed by using only `justice_legal` for EDA as it is the superset of the case centered data.

Cleaning: Case Centered Data

Drop columns with high NA percentage

```
# Look at NA percentage in each column
```

```

na_percentage <- colSums(is.na(case_legal)) / nrow(case_legal) * 100
na_percentage <- na_percentage[na_percentage > 50]
print(na_percentage)

```

```

##      petitionerState      respondentState      adminAction      adminActionState
##           80.35805           72.80733           69.78994           92.23995
##      caseOriginState      caseSourceState      authorityDecision2
##           73.40648           77.75933           83.65697

```

```
# Remove columns with high NA percentages
case_legal_na_cols_removed <- case_legal[, !colnames(case_legal) %in% c(
  "petitionerState", "respondentState", "adminAction",
  "adminActionState", "caseOriginState", "caseSourceState",
  "authorityDecision2"
)]

data_clean_v1 <- case_legal_na_cols_removed
```

Columns with high NA percentages: petitionerState, respondentState, adminAction, adminActionState, caseOriginState, caseSourceState, and authorityDecision2. These columns will be dropped.

Drop rows with NA

```
# Remove rows with NA values now that major NA columns are already removed
case_legal_na_removed <- data_clean_v1 %>%
  drop_na()

data_clean_v2 <- case_legal_na_removed

print(dim(data_clean_v2))
```

```
## [1] 9192 46
```

The resulting table has 9,192 columns and 46 rows

Cleaning: Justice Centered Data

Drop columns with high NA percentage

```
# Look at NA percentage in each column
na_percentage_j <- colSums(is.na(justice_legal)) / nrow(justice_legal) * 100
na_percentage_j <- na_percentage_j[na_percentage_j > 50]
print(na_percentage_j)
```

```
##      petitionerState      respondentState      adminAction      adminActionState
##           80.33746           72.80668           69.78663           92.24360
##      caseOriginState      caseSourceState      authorityDecision2      firstAgreement
##           73.37314           77.74286           83.65323           86.17369
##      secondAgreement
##           97.44086
```

```
# Remove columns with high NA percentages
justice_legal_na_cols_removed <- justice_legal[, !colnames(justice_legal) %in% c(
  "petitionerState", "respondentState", "adminAction",
  "adminActionState", "caseOriginState", "caseSourceState",
  "authorityDecision2", "firstAgreement", "secondAgreement"
)]

data_clean_jv1 <- justice_legal_na_cols_removed
```

Columns with high NA percentages: petitionerState, respondentState, adminAction, adminActionState, caseOriginState, caseSourceState, authorityDecision2, firstAgreement, secondAgreement. These columns will be dropped.

Drop rows with NA

```
# Remove rows with NA values now that major NA columns are already removed
justice_legal_na_removed <- data_clean_jv1 %>%
  drop_na()

data_clean_jv2 <- justice_legal_na_removed

print(dim(data_clean_jv2))
```

```
## [1] 71965    52
```

The resulting table has 71,965 columns and 46 rows

Examining Columns

```
head(data_clean_v2)
```

```
##      caseId      docketId      caseIssuesId      voteId dateDecision
## 1 1946-001 1946-001-01 1946-001-01-01 1946-001-01-01-01 11/18/1946
## 2 1946-002 1946-002-01 1946-002-01-01 1946-002-01-01-01 11/18/1946
## 3 1946-002 1946-002-02 1946-002-02-01 1946-002-02-01-01 11/18/1946
## 4 1946-002 1946-002-03 1946-002-03-01 1946-002-03-01-01 11/18/1946
## 5 1946-002 1946-002-04 1946-002-04-01 1946-002-04-01-01 11/18/1946
## 6 1946-002 1946-002-05 1946-002-05-01 1946-002-05-01-01 11/18/1946
##      decisionType      usCite      sctCite      ledCite      lexisCite term
## 1              1 329 U.S. 1 67 S. Ct. 6 91 L. Ed. 3 1946 U.S. LEXIS 1724 1946
## 2              1 329 U.S. 14 67 S. Ct. 13 91 L. Ed. 12 1946 U.S. LEXIS 1725 1946
## 3              1 329 U.S. 14 67 S. Ct. 13 91 L. Ed. 12 1946 U.S. LEXIS 1725 1946
## 4              1 329 U.S. 14 67 S. Ct. 13 91 L. Ed. 12 1946 U.S. LEXIS 1725 1946
## 5              1 329 U.S. 14 67 S. Ct. 13 91 L. Ed. 12 1946 U.S. LEXIS 1725 1946
## 6              1 329 U.S. 14 67 S. Ct. 13 91 L. Ed. 12 1946 U.S. LEXIS 1725 1946
##      naturalCourt      chief docket
## 1          1301 Vinson      24
## 2          1301 Vinson      12
## 3          1301 Vinson      17
## 4          1301 Vinson      14
## 5          1301 Vinson      19
## 6          1301 Vinson      13
##
##                                     caseName
## 1 HALLIBURTON OIL WELL CEMENTING CO. v. WALKER et al., DOING BUSINESS AS DEPTHOGRAPH CO.
## 2                                     CLEVELAND v. UNITED STATES
## 3                                     CLEVELAND v. UNITED STATES
## 4                                     CLEVELAND v. UNITED STATES
## 5                                     CLEVELAND v. UNITED STATES
```

```

## 6 CLEVELAND v. UNITED STATES
## dateArgument dateRearg petitioner respondent jurisdiction threeJudgeFdc
## 1 1/9/1946 10/23/1946 198 172 6 0
## 2 10/10/1945 10/17/1946 100 27 1 0
## 3 10/10/1945 10/17/1946 100 27 1 0
## 4 10/10/1945 10/17/1946 100 27 1 0
## 5 10/10/1945 10/17/1946 100 27 1 0
## 6 10/10/1945 10/17/1946 100 27 1 0
## caseOrigin caseSource lcDisagreement certReason lcDisposition
## 1 51 29 0 11 2
## 2 123 30 0 4 2
## 3 123 30 0 4 2
## 4 123 30 0 4 2
## 5 123 30 0 4 2
## 6 123 30 0 4 2
## lcDispositionDirection declarationUncon caseDisposition
## 1 1 1 3
## 2 1 1 2
## 3 1 1 2
## 4 1 1 2
## 5 1 1 2
## 6 1 1 2
## caseDispositionUnusual partyWinning precedentAlteration voteUnclear issue
## 1 0 1 1 0 80180
## 2 0 0 0 0 10500
## 3 0 0 0 0 10500
## 4 0 0 0 0 10500
## 5 0 0 0 0 10500
## 6 0 0 0 0 10500
## issueArea decisionDirection decisionDirectionDissent authorityDecision1
## 1 8 2 0 4
## 2 1 1 0 4
## 3 1 1 0 4
## 4 1 1 0 4
## 5 1 1 0 4
## 6 1 1 0 4
## lawType lawSupp lawMinor majOpinWriter majOpinAssigner splitVote
## 1 6 600 35 U.S.C. § 33 78 78 1
## 2 6 600 18 U.S.C. § 398 81 87 1
## 3 6 600 18 U.S.C. § 398 81 87 1
## 4 6 600 18 U.S.C. § 398 81 87 1
## 5 6 600 18 U.S.C. § 398 81 87 1
## 6 6 600 18 U.S.C. § 398 81 87 1
## majVotes minVotes
## 1 8 1
## 2 6 3
## 3 6 3
## 4 6 3
## 5 6 3
## 6 6 3

```

```
head(data_clean_jv2)
```

```
## caseId docketId caseIssuesId voteId dateDecision
```

## 1	1946-001	1946-001-01	1946-001-01-01	1946-001-01-01-01-01	11/18/1946
## 2	1946-001	1946-001-01	1946-001-01-01	1946-001-01-01-01-02	11/18/1946
## 3	1946-001	1946-001-01	1946-001-01-01	1946-001-01-01-01-03	11/18/1946
## 4	1946-001	1946-001-01	1946-001-01-01	1946-001-01-01-01-04	11/18/1946
## 5	1946-001	1946-001-01	1946-001-01-01	1946-001-01-01-01-05	11/18/1946
## 6	1946-001	1946-001-01	1946-001-01-01	1946-001-01-01-01-06	11/18/1946
##	decisionType	usCite	sctCite	ledCite	lexisCite term
## 1	1	329 U.S. 1 67 S. Ct. 6 91 L. Ed. 3 1946 U.S. LEXIS 1724	1946		
## 2	1	329 U.S. 1 67 S. Ct. 6 91 L. Ed. 3 1946 U.S. LEXIS 1724	1946		
## 3	1	329 U.S. 1 67 S. Ct. 6 91 L. Ed. 3 1946 U.S. LEXIS 1724	1946		
## 4	1	329 U.S. 1 67 S. Ct. 6 91 L. Ed. 3 1946 U.S. LEXIS 1724	1946		
## 5	1	329 U.S. 1 67 S. Ct. 6 91 L. Ed. 3 1946 U.S. LEXIS 1724	1946		
## 6	1	329 U.S. 1 67 S. Ct. 6 91 L. Ed. 3 1946 U.S. LEXIS 1724	1946		
##	naturalCourt	chief	docket		
## 1	1301	Vinson	24		
## 2	1301	Vinson	24		
## 3	1301	Vinson	24		
## 4	1301	Vinson	24		
## 5	1301	Vinson	24		
## 6	1301	Vinson	24		
##					caseName
## 1	HALLIBURTON OIL WELL CEMENTING CO. v. WALKER et al., DOING BUSINESS AS DEPTHOGRAPH CO.				
## 2	HALLIBURTON OIL WELL CEMENTING CO. v. WALKER et al., DOING BUSINESS AS DEPTHOGRAPH CO.				
## 3	HALLIBURTON OIL WELL CEMENTING CO. v. WALKER et al., DOING BUSINESS AS DEPTHOGRAPH CO.				
## 4	HALLIBURTON OIL WELL CEMENTING CO. v. WALKER et al., DOING BUSINESS AS DEPTHOGRAPH CO.				
## 5	HALLIBURTON OIL WELL CEMENTING CO. v. WALKER et al., DOING BUSINESS AS DEPTHOGRAPH CO.				
## 6	HALLIBURTON OIL WELL CEMENTING CO. v. WALKER et al., DOING BUSINESS AS DEPTHOGRAPH CO.				
##	dateArgument	dateRearg	petitioner	respondent	jurisdiction threeJudgeFdc
## 1	1/9/1946	10/23/1946	198	172	6 0
## 2	1/9/1946	10/23/1946	198	172	6 0
## 3	1/9/1946	10/23/1946	198	172	6 0
## 4	1/9/1946	10/23/1946	198	172	6 0
## 5	1/9/1946	10/23/1946	198	172	6 0
## 6	1/9/1946	10/23/1946	198	172	6 0
##	caseOrigin	caseSource	lcDisagreement	certReason	lcDisposition
## 1	51	29	0	11	2
## 2	51	29	0	11	2
## 3	51	29	0	11	2
## 4	51	29	0	11	2
## 5	51	29	0	11	2
## 6	51	29	0	11	2
##	lcDispositionDirection	declarationUncon	caseDisposition		
## 1	1	1	3		
## 2	1	1	3		
## 3	1	1	3		
## 4	1	1	3		
## 5	1	1	3		
## 6	1	1	3		
##	caseDispositionUnusual	partyWinning	precedentAlteration	voteUnclear	issue
## 1	0	1	1	0	80180
## 2	0	1	1	0	80180
## 3	0	1	1	0	80180
## 4	0	1	1	0	80180
## 5	0	1	1	0	80180

	0	1	1	0	80180			
## 6	issueArea	decisionDirection	decisionDirectionDissent	authorityDecision1				
## 1	8	2	0	4				
## 2	8	2	0	4				
## 3	8	2	0	4				
## 4	8	2	0	4				
## 5	8	2	0	4				
## 6	8	2	0	4				
##	lawType	lawSupp	lawMinor	majOpinWriter	majOpinAssigner	splitVote		
## 1	6	600 35 U.S.C. § 33		78	78	1		
## 2	6	600 35 U.S.C. § 33		78	78	1		
## 3	6	600 35 U.S.C. § 33		78	78	1		
## 4	6	600 35 U.S.C. § 33		78	78	1		
## 5	6	600 35 U.S.C. § 33		78	78	1		
## 6	6	600 35 U.S.C. § 33		78	78	1		
##	majVotes	minVotes	justice	justiceName	vote	opinion	direction	majority
## 1	8	1	86	HHBurton	2	1	1	1
## 2	8	1	84	RHJackson	1	1	2	2
## 3	8	1	81	WODouglas	1	1	2	2
## 4	8	1	80	FFrankfurter	4	2	2	2
## 5	8	1	79	SFreed	1	1	2	2
## 6	8	1	78	HLBlack	1	2	2	2

Which columns are different in Justics and Case centered data

```
# Compare columns between data_clean_v2 and data_clean_jv2
columns_in_jv2 <- colnames(data_clean_jv2)
columns_in_v2 <- colnames(data_clean_v2)

# Find columns unique to each data frame
unique_to_jv2 <- setdiff(columns_in_jv2, columns_in_v2)
unique_to_v2 <- setdiff(columns_in_v2, columns_in_jv2)

# Print results
list(unique_to_data_clean_jv2 = unique_to_jv2)
```

```
## $unique_to_data_clean_jv2
## [1] "justice"      "justiceName" "vote"         "opinion"      "direction"
## [6] "majority"
```

```
list(unique_to_data_clean_v2 = unique_to_v2)
```

```
## $unique_to_data_clean_v2
## character(0)
```

justice, justiceName, vote, opinion, direction, and majority are in the justice centered data and not in the case centered data.

Create case consistency between justice and case data. The following will see which is there are any caseId that are in justice data and not case data and vice versa.

```

# Find caseIds in data_clean_v3 but not in data_clean_jv3
caseIds_not_in_justice <- setdiff(data_clean_v2$caseId, data_clean_jv2$caseId)

# Find caseIds in data_clean_jv3 but not in data_clean_v3
caseIds_not_in_case <- setdiff(data_clean_jv2$caseId, data_clean_v2$caseId)

# Print results
cat("Number of caseIds in case-centered but not in justice-centered:", length(caseIds_not_in_justice), "\n")

## Number of caseIds in case-centered but not in justice-centered: 665

cat("Number of caseIds in justice-centered but not in case-centered:", length(caseIds_not_in_case), "\n")

## Number of caseIds in justice-centered but not in case-centered: 0

Since there are only 665 mismatches cases that are in the case data but not the justice data. These will be removed to ensure consistency among the data set for new feature engineering.

# Remove the 665 caseIds that are not in justice-centered data
data_clean_v2_filtered <- data_clean_v2[!data_clean_v2$caseId %in% caseIds_not_in_justice, ]

# Check the dimensions of the filtered data
print(dim(data_clean_v2_filtered))

## [1] 8350    46

# Confirm the removal by checking if any of the removed caseIds are still present
any_remaining <- any(caseIds_not_in_justice %in% data_clean_v2_filtered$caseId)
print(paste("Any remaining removed caseIds:", any_remaining))

## [1] "Any remaining removed caseIds: FALSE"

```

Response Variable partyWinning is the response variable. This is chosen as a binary coding of the caseDisposition variable which gives the different way the court will treat the lower courts decision, reducing to favorable, unfavorable, and unsure.

With some adjustments, this variable is coded according to the following rules: - The petitioning party lost if the Supreme Court affirmed (caseDisposition=2) or dismissed the case/denied the petition (caseDisposition=9). - The petitioning party won in part or in full if the Supreme Court reversed (caseDisposition=3), reversed and remanded (caseDisposition= 4), vacated and remanded (caseDisposition=5), affirmed and reversed in part (caseDisposition=6), affirmed and reverse in part and remanded (caseDisposition=7), or vacated (caseDisposition=8) - The petitioning party won or lost may be unclear if the Court certified to/from a lower court.

```

party_win_counts <- table(data_clean_v2$partyWinning)
party_win_counts_j <- table(data_clean_jv2$partyWinning)
print(party_win_counts)

##
##      0      1      2
## 3550 5639      3

```

```
print(party_win_counts_j)
```

```
##
##      0      1
## 28228 43737
```

There are only 3 entries in the case centered data where the decision on the lower courts ruling is unclear. Justice centered data has none. Since it represents such a small portion of the data, that column will be removed. This response variable will be binary.

```
case_legal_partyWin_binary <- data_clean_v2[data_clean_v2$partyWinning != 2,]

# keeping versions the same for consistency
data_clean_v3 <- case_legal_partyWin_binary
data_clean_jv3 <- data_clean_jv2
```

```
head(data_clean_v3)
```

Explanatory Variables

```
##      caseId      docketId      caseIssuesId      voteId dateDecision
## 1 1946-001 1946-001-01 1946-001-01-01 1946-001-01-01-01 11/18/1946
## 2 1946-002 1946-002-01 1946-002-01-01 1946-002-01-01-01 11/18/1946
## 3 1946-002 1946-002-02 1946-002-02-01 1946-002-02-01-01 11/18/1946
## 4 1946-002 1946-002-03 1946-002-03-01 1946-002-03-01-01 11/18/1946
## 5 1946-002 1946-002-04 1946-002-04-01 1946-002-04-01-01 11/18/1946
## 6 1946-002 1946-002-05 1946-002-05-01 1946-002-05-01-01 11/18/1946
##      decisionType      usCite      sctCite      ledCite      lexisCite term
## 1      1      329 U.S. 1      67 S. Ct. 6      91 L. Ed. 3 1946 U.S. LEXIS 1724 1946
## 2      1      329 U.S. 14      67 S. Ct. 13      91 L. Ed. 12 1946 U.S. LEXIS 1725 1946
## 3      1      329 U.S. 14      67 S. Ct. 13      91 L. Ed. 12 1946 U.S. LEXIS 1725 1946
## 4      1      329 U.S. 14      67 S. Ct. 13      91 L. Ed. 12 1946 U.S. LEXIS 1725 1946
## 5      1      329 U.S. 14      67 S. Ct. 13      91 L. Ed. 12 1946 U.S. LEXIS 1725 1946
## 6      1      329 U.S. 14      67 S. Ct. 13      91 L. Ed. 12 1946 U.S. LEXIS 1725 1946
##      naturalCourt      chief docket
## 1      1301 Vinson      24
## 2      1301 Vinson      12
## 3      1301 Vinson      17
## 4      1301 Vinson      14
## 5      1301 Vinson      19
## 6      1301 Vinson      13
##
##                                     caseName
## 1 HALLIBURTON OIL WELL CEMENTING CO. v. WALKER et al., DOING BUSINESS AS DEPTHOGRAPH CO.
## 2                                     CLEVELAND v. UNITED STATES
## 3                                     CLEVELAND v. UNITED STATES
## 4                                     CLEVELAND v. UNITED STATES
## 5                                     CLEVELAND v. UNITED STATES
## 6                                     CLEVELAND v. UNITED STATES
##      dateArgument      dateRearg petitioner respondent jurisdiction threeJudgeFdc
```

## 1	1/9/1946	10/23/1946	198	172	6	0
## 2	10/10/1945	10/17/1946	100	27	1	0
## 3	10/10/1945	10/17/1946	100	27	1	0
## 4	10/10/1945	10/17/1946	100	27	1	0
## 5	10/10/1945	10/17/1946	100	27	1	0
## 6	10/10/1945	10/17/1946	100	27	1	0
##	caseOrigin	caseSource	lcDisagreement	certReason	lcDisposition	
## 1	51	29	0	11	2	
## 2	123	30	0	4	2	
## 3	123	30	0	4	2	
## 4	123	30	0	4	2	
## 5	123	30	0	4	2	
## 6	123	30	0	4	2	
##	lcDispositionDirection	declarationUncon	caseDisposition			
## 1	1	1	3			
## 2	1	1	2			
## 3	1	1	2			
## 4	1	1	2			
## 5	1	1	2			
## 6	1	1	2			
##	caseDispositionUnusual	partyWinning	precedentAlteration	voteUnclear	issue	
## 1	0	1	1	0	80180	
## 2	0	0	0	0	10500	
## 3	0	0	0	0	10500	
## 4	0	0	0	0	10500	
## 5	0	0	0	0	10500	
## 6	0	0	0	0	10500	
##	issueArea	decisionDirection	decisionDirectionDissent	authorityDecision1		
## 1	8	2	0	4		
## 2	1	1	0	4		
## 3	1	1	0	4		
## 4	1	1	0	4		
## 5	1	1	0	4		
## 6	1	1	0	4		
##	lawType	lawSupp	lawMinor	majOpinWriter	majOpinAssigner	splitVote
## 1	6	600 35 U.S.C. § 33		78	78	1
## 2	6	600 18 U.S.C. § 398		81	87	1
## 3	6	600 18 U.S.C. § 398		81	87	1
## 4	6	600 18 U.S.C. § 398		81	87	1
## 5	6	600 18 U.S.C. § 398		81	87	1
## 6	6	600 18 U.S.C. § 398		81	87	1
##	majVotes	minVotes				
## 1	8	1				
## 2	6	3				
## 3	6	3				
## 4	6	3				
## 5	6	3				
## 6	6	3				